

*Asiatische Studien*  
*Études Asiatiques*  
*LXV · 3 · 2011*

*Zeitschrift der Schweizerischen Asiengesellschaft*  
*Revue de la Société Suisse – Asie*



Peter Lang

Bern · Berlin · Bruxelles · Frankfurt am Main · New York · Oxford · Wien

ISSN 0004-4717

© Peter Lang AG, Internationaler Verlag der Wissenschaften, Bern 2011  
Hochfeldstrasse 32, CH-3012 Bern  
info@peterlang.com, www.peterlang.com, www.peterlang.net

Alle Rechte vorbehalten.

Das Werk einschliesslich aller seiner Teile ist urheberrechtlich geschützt.  
Jede Verwertung ausserhalb der engen Grenzen des Urheberrechtsgesetzes  
ist ohne Zustimmung des Verlages unzulässig und strafbar. Das gilt  
insbesondere für Vervielfältigungen, Übersetzungen, Mikroverfilmungen und  
die Einspeicherung und Verarbeitung in elektronischen Systemen.

Printed in Hungary

# INHALTSVERZEICHNIS – TABLE DES MATIÈRES CONTENTS

SVETLANA GORSHENINA.....	625
<i>Le Recueil Turkestanais de Mežov. L'utopie d'une somme exhaustive des connaissances sur l'Asie centrale</i>	
JÖRN HAPPEL.....	661
<i>Kolonialisierte Lebenswelten. Zentralasiens Nomaden als frontier-Gesellschaft des Zarenreichs</i>	
JÜRGEN PAUL.....	695
<i>Zerfall und Bestehen. Die Čaun-i qurban im 14. Jahrhundert</i>	
KRISZTINA TELEKI.....	735
<i>Sources, history, and remnants of the Mongolian monastic capital city</i>	
D. G. TOR.....	767
<i>Mamlūk Loyalty: Evidence from the late Seljuq period</i>	
THOMAS WELSFORD.....	797
<i>Rethinking the Ḥamzahids of Ḥiṣār</i>	
<i>Rezensionen – Comptes rendus – Reviews</i>	
BAXTIYAR M. BABADŽANOV.....	825
<i>Kokandskoe chanstvo: vlast', politika, religija. (Jörn Happel)</i>	
T. GANESAN.....	828
<i>Two Śaiva Teachers of the Sixteenth Century. Nigamajñāna I and his Disciple Nigamajñāna II. (André Padoux)</i>	
ANNE LUMBAN TOBING.....	830
<i>Schriftkunst in Rot und Weiß: Künstlersiegel der Ming- und Ch'ing-Zeit, unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Siegel des Chao Chih-ch'ien (1829–1884). (Lis Jung Lu)</i>	

MICHAEL F. MARRA.....	839
<i>Seasons and Landscapes in Japanese Poetry. An Introduction to Haiku and Waka.</i> (Robert F. Wittkamp)	
PETER SCHWIEGER.....	846
<i>Tibetische Handschriften und Blockdrucke.</i> Teil 13. ( <i>Die mTshur-phu-Ausgabe der Sammlung Rin-chen gter-mdzod chen-mo, nach dem Exemplar der Orientabteilung, Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin – Preussischer Kulturbesitz, Hs or 778, Bände 40–52.</i> ) (Karénina Kollmar-Paulenz)	
Autoren – Auteurs – Authors.....	851

# RETHINKING THE ḤAMZAHIDS OF ḤIṢĀR

Thomas Welsford, Oxford University

## *Abstract*

This article considers a hitherto-understudied episode in the history of 16<sup>th</sup>-century Central Asia. The Ḥamzahids of Ḥiṣār were a family of actors who for approximately 70 years governed a territory to the east of central Mā warā al-nahr, in what is today southwestern Tajikistan, and whose activities have long been regarded as marginal to the history of Central Asia under Abū'l-Khayrid rule. Drawing upon material from a range of narrative, epistolary and epigraphic sources, I argue that the Ḥamzahids were in fact a highly influential party who maintained close relations both with their Abū'l-Khayrid neighbours and with the rulers of Badakhshan and elsewhere. By comparing the treatment accorded to the Ḥamzahids in contemporary sources with what we find in sources composed after their downfall in 1573, I argue that ideas of a 'marginalised' Ḥamzahid Ḥiṣār stem largely from a later, Bukharo-centric narrative tradition which has often exerted undue influence on modern scholarly perspectives. I conclude that rethinking the history of the Ḥamzahids of Ḥiṣār may allow us to gain a clearer perspective upon the nature of dynastic politics more generally in early modern Central Asia.

## 1. A State of Exception?

At some point in the late 1540s, the famed Kubrāwī shaykh Kamāl al-Dīn Ḥusayn Khwārazmī left his former haunts of Bukhara and Samarqand and traveled east. From the lands of Abū'l-Khayrid-held central Mā warā al-nahr, he headed to Ḥiṣār, or Ḥiṣār-i Shādmān, a town situated near Dushanbe in the lowlands of what is today southwestern Tajikistan. According to the *Jāddat al-‘āshiqīn*, a hagiographic work dedicated in large part to Khwārazmī's activities and completed a few years after his death in 1551/2, the shaykh was responding to an invitation from the ruler of Ḥiṣār-i Shādmān. This ruler was a man called Tīmūr Aḥmad.<sup>1</sup>

1 Shihāb al-Dīn KHWĀRAZMĪ, *Jāddat al-‘āshiqīn* (ca. 1558), MS BL IO Islamic 640, f. 62a. The passage is noted in e.g. R. MUKIMOV, "Mavzolei-ye Makhdum-e Azam." In: N. N. NEG-MATOV / R. S. MUKIMOV / Z. A. ALIEVA / P. T. SAMOYLIK (eds.), *Hissorskii Zapovednik i ego arkhitekturnye pamiatniki*, (Dushanbe: Maorif, 1994), pp. 53–67, and F. SCHWARZ,

Tīmūr Aḥmad was not on good terms with the rulers of Mā warā al-nahr. On several occasions, we read in the *Jāddat al-‘āshiqīn*, “he had the *khuṭbah* [= Friday prayer address] and the *sikkah* [= numismatic titulature] issued in Mā warā al-nahr in his name.” Such behaviour evidently struck Shihāb al-Dīn Khwārazmī, author of the work, as a gross instance of *lèse-majesté*. The issue of the *khuṭbah* and the *sikkah* was conventionally recognized in the Islamicate world as a perquisite of regnal sovereignty: by acting as he did, therefore, Tīmūr Aḥmad was deliberately repudiating an established tradition of rule over the region by his western neighbours.

Tīmūr Aḥmad’s presumptuousness was compounded, the author continues, by the fact that “he was not of the khalid family [*az dawlat-i khāqānī*].” That is to say, he was not a member of that Abū’l-Khayrid dynastic collective which for most of the sixteenth century ruled Mā warā al-nahr. Although Tīmūr Aḥmad, like his Abū’l-Khayrid neighbours, shared a line of Chinggīsid ancestry through the figure of Shībān b. Jūchī<sup>2</sup>, their respective genealogies were substantially different. Whereas Tīmūr Aḥmad – or Tīmūr Sultan, as he is called in the late sixteenth-century *Sharaf-nāmah-yi Shāhī* and a number of other works<sup>3</sup> – was descended from Shībān’s great-great-great-great-great grandson Khidr b. Ibrāhīm, the rulers of Mā warā al-nahr were descended from another son of Ibrāhīm called Dawlat Shaykh;<sup>4</sup> it was Dawlat Shaykh’s son, the famed mid-fifteenth-century warlord and statesman Abū’l-Khayr, that the Abū’l-Khayrids of the sixteenth century traced their founding common ancestor. Through his own Shībānid line of descent, the Ḥiṣārī ruler Tīmūr Sultan / Tīmūr Aḥmad

---

“Unser Weg schließt tausend Wege ein,”: *Derwische und Gesellschaft im islamischen Mittelasien im 16. Jahrhundert* (Berlin: Klaus Schwarz Verlag, 2000), p. 160.

2 Hāfiz-i TĀNISH, *Sharaf-nāmah-yi shāhī*, ed. M. A. SALAKHETDINOVA (2 vols, Moscow: Nauka, 1983/1989), I. 76.

3 Thus notably Amīr ‘ABDALLĀH, *Iskandar-nāmah* (ca. 1630), MS IVANRUZ 1510, f. 115b; anonymous chronicle (mid seventeenth century), MS RAS Morley 162, ff. 6a–7a, 18b–19a; anonymous *Ughūz-nāmah* (copied/ composed ca. 1850), MS IVANRUZ 185/IV, ff. 59b–71b [f. 66a].

4 FAḌL-ALLĀH b. Rūzbihān Khunjī IṢFAHĀNĪ, *Mihmān-nāmah-yi Bukhārā* (1509), ed. M. SUTŪDAH (Tehran: Bungāh-i tarjumah wa nashr-i kitāb, 1341/1962–1963) p. 45, ‘ABDALLĀH b. Muḥammad NAṢR-ALLĀH, *Zubdat al-āthār* (ca. 1525), MS IVANRUZ 5368, ff. 471b–2a, MAS‘UD b. ‘Uthmān KŪHISTĀNĪ, *Tārīkh-i Abū’l-Khayr Khānī* (ca. 1540), MS BL Add. 26188, f. 352a, Hāfiz-i TĀNISH, *Sharaf-nāmah-yi shāhī*, I. 76; ABŪ’L-GHĀZĪ, *Shajarat-i Turk* (ca. 1665), ed. and tr. P. I. DESMAISONS as *Histoire des Mongols et des Tatares par Aboul-Ghāzī Bēhādour Khan* (St. Petersburg: 1871–1872; reissued Amsterdam: Philo Press, 1970), pp. 182–183; and elsewhere.

shared in Ibrāhīm the same great-grandfather as ‘Abd al-Laṭīf, who until his death in 1552 was that ruler of Samarqand whose authority Tīmūr Sultan is reported to have undermined.

Shihāb al-Dīn Khwārazmī’s exclusion of Tīmūr Sultan from the *dawlat-i khāqānī* offers a case study in what Martin Dickson famously conceptualized as “Uzbek dynastic theory”. By this somewhat misleading term – given the absence of any sixteenth-century texts, normative or descriptive, addressing the matter, dynastic practices seem to have remained signally *un*–“theorised” – Dickson identifies the conventions and devices in the Abū’l-Khayrid khanate whereby regnal authority, and the wider potential eligibility for such authority, sequentially devolved.<sup>5</sup> In the absence of a primogenitural mechanism for succession, he observes, authority instead passed gerontocratically to the oldest living member of a ruling collective: the exclusivity of which latter, waning from generation to generation with the geometric increase of its members, was periodically boosted by the elimination or alienation of all but a single sub-group therein. Like the members of the original collective, he continues, members of the subsequently-prevailing sub-group traced their descent from an eponymous ancestor: namely he from whom, as a result of the actions of himself or his successors, descent thereafter remained both a necessary and a sufficient qualification for khanal eligibility. In the early sixteenth century, Dickson suggests, the mid fifteenth-century figure of Abū’l-Khayr was just such an eponymous figure: and khanal eligibility was a perquisite of his descendents alone. Along with his fellow Ḥiṣārī rulers, Tīmūr Sultan was not one of these descendents. Consequently, the argument would run, he could not claim to be *az dawlat-i khāqānī*.

Written over fifty years ago, Dickson’s analysis still furnishes some invaluable insights into the mechanics of collective rule in the Turco-Mongolic world. But the picture which thus accrues of sixteenth-century Ḥiṣār as an exception to the Abū’l-Khayrid state of order is not an entirely helpful one, unduly coloured as it is by a late sixteenth-century source tradition exemplified by the *Sharaf-nāmah-yi Shāhī* which, as we shall see, had reason retrospectively to situate the Ḥiṣārī regime outside the Abū’l-Khayrid disposition of power. By juxtaposing this dominant tradition against what we find in a range of earlier, less commonly exposed sources, I propose to suggest that Ḥiṣār in the sixteenth century was not

5 Martin DICKSON, “Uzbek Dynastic Theory in the 16<sup>th</sup> Century.” In: *Trudy XXV Mezhdunarodnogo Kongressa Vostokovedov* (Moscow: 1960), pp. 208–216.

always so marginal a polity, and to consider what the history of this regime can tell us more widely about the practice of politics in early-modern Central Asia.

## 2. Family Origins

In the 1550s, Shihāb al-Dīn Khwārazmī distinguished the incumbent Ḥiṣārī ruler from the *dawlat-i khāqānī*. In the years beforehand, there is little evidence that any such distinction would have been meaningful.

Ṭīmūr Sultan was not the first individual in his line of descent to exercise rule in Ḥiṣār. Indeed, the careers of several of his predecessors are substantially better attested than his own. His grandfather, Bakhtiyār b. Khidr, played an important role in the expansionary activities of his cousin Abū'l-Khayr in the mid fifteenth-century Dasht-i Qipchāq, in recognition of which he was appointed to gubernatorial authority over Sūzāq, a town located some 60 miles northeast of the Syr Darya in the relative vicinity of Turkistān.<sup>6</sup> Abū'l-Khayr's steppe-based polity proved short-lived, unable to survive a disastrous defeat at the hands of the Mongolian Oirats and mass defections by the likes of Girāy Sultan and Jānī-Bīk Sultan, former associates who now established a rival confederacy subsequently to evolve into the Qazaq khanate.<sup>7</sup> In the chaos following Abū'l-Khayr's death, Bakhtiyār's sons Ḥamzah – Ṭīmūr Sultan's father – and Maḥdī remained loyal to the late khan's grandson Muḥammad Shībānī, their second cousin once removed<sup>8</sup>. When, at the turn of the sixteenth century, Muḥammad Shībānī led an

6 *Tārīkh-i Abū'l-Khayr Khānī*, f. 323a; discussion in K. A. PISHCHULINA, "Prisyrdar'inskie goroda i ikh znachenie v istorii kazakhskikh khanstv v XV–XVII vekakh." In: *Kazakhstan v XV–XVII vekakh* (Alma-Ata: 1969), p. 32.

7 B. A. AKHMEDOV, *Gosudarstvo kochevykh uzbekov* (Moscow: Nauka, 1965), pp. 67–68; I. Ia. ZLATKIN, *Istoriia Dzhungarskogo Khanstva (1635–1758)* (Moscow: Nauka, 1983), pp. 40–41; T. I. SULTANOV, *Podnyatye na beloi koshme. Potomki Chingiz-khana* (Almaty, Daik-Press 2001), p. 130.

8 Mullā Kamāl al-Dīn 'ALĪ BINĀ'Ī, *Shībānī-nāmah* (ca. 1510), ed. Kazuyuki KUBO. In: Eiji MANO (ed.), *A Synthetical Study on Central Asian Culture in the Turco-Islamic Period* (Kyoto: Kyoto University, 1997), pp. 14–15. Ḥamzah and Maḥdī's Bakhtiyārid parentage is widely accepted. However, 'A. GHAFĀRĪ-FARD, *Rawābiṭ-i Ṣafawīyyah wa Ūzbikān* (Tehran: Daftar-i muṭāl'āt-i siyāsī wa bayn al-milālī, 1376/1997–1998), p. 133, records a rogue tradition in the *Jang-Gushā-yi Khāqān* according to which Ḥamzah and Maḥdī were sons of Muḥammad Shībānī himself.



Uzbek invasion into Tīmūrid-governed Mā warā al-nahr<sup>9</sup>, the two brothers played a significant role, notably helping to secure the submission of the Tīmūrid garrison at Karmīnah, a town in the Zarafshān valley approximately halfway between Bukhara and Samarqand.<sup>10</sup> In recognition of such services, Ḥamzah was then appointed to gubernatorial authority over Qarākul, a town situated southwest of Bukhara towards the Amu Darya river and the Khurāsāni frontier. The gubernatorial appointee quickly proved unpopular with the local population, however, and to quell an attempted uprising Muḥammad Shībānī was forced to remove Ḥamzah from his post.<sup>11</sup> Ḥamzah may thereafter have played a role in Muḥammad Shībānī's campaign into Khwārazm,<sup>12</sup> before in 1503 moving with Muḥammad Shībānī into the southeast of the khanate, where Tīmūrid factions were continuing to offer stern resistance to the Uzbek advance.

As is widely related, Muḥammad Shībānī opted to place Ḥamzah in charge of Ḥiṣār,<sup>13</sup> which he had recently captured from its Tīmūrid governor Khusraw Shāh.<sup>14</sup> Regarding the exact nature of Maḥdī's appointment there is some uncertainty, with some sources suggesting that he was dispatched to Ḥiṣār alongside his brother,<sup>15</sup> and others variously reporting that he was sent to Chaghāniyān,<sup>16</sup> otherwise known as Dih-i Naw,<sup>17</sup> a little way to the west of Ḥiṣār itself, or to

- 9 For details, see particularly A. A. SEMENOV, "Sheibani-khan i zavoevanie im imperii timuridov." In: *Materialy po Istorii Tadzhiikov i Uzbekov Srednei Azii* (Trudy Insituta istorii, arkeologii i etnografii AN TadzhiSSR, Stalinabad, 1954), pp. 39–83; M. SZUPPE, *Entre Timourides, Uzbekes et Safavides: Question de l'histoire politique et sociale de Hérat dans la première moitié du XVIe siècle* (Studia Islamica Cahiers 12, Paris 1992); and N. KILIÇ, "Change in Political Culture: the Rise of Sheybani Khan." In: *L'Héritage Timouride: Iran – Asia centrale – Inde XVIe–XVIIIe siècles* (Cahiers d'Asie Centrale 3/4, 1997), pp. 57–68.
- 10 *Zubdat al-āthār*, f. 473b.
- 11 A. M. AKRAMOV (ed. and trans.), *Tavarikh-i Nusrat-name* (Tashkent: Fan, 1967), pp. 10–11.
- 12 *Iskandar-nāmah*, f. 115b.
- 13 BINĀ'Ī, *Shībānī-nāmah*, p. 80; Muḥammad ṢĀLIḤ, *Shībānī-nāmah*, p. 386; *Zubdat al-āthār*, f. 476a; *Sharaf-nāmah-yi shāhī* I. 82; Maḥmūd b. Amīr WALĪ, *Baḥr al-asrār* (ca. 1645), MS IVANRUZ 7418, f. 292a.
- 14 Muḥammad ṢĀLIḤ, *Shībānī-nāmah*, pp. 206–224 and 348–350; Ḥamzah's own role in the capture of the region is noted on p. 214.
- 15 BINĀ'Ī, *Shībānī-nāmah*, p. 80; *Mihmān-nāmah-yi Bukhārā*, p. 4; *Zubdat al-āthār*, f. 476a: all as above.
- 16 Mīrzā Ḥaydar DÜGHLĀT, *Tārīkh-i Rashīdī* (1546), ed. N. ELIAS, tr. E. DENISON ROSS (London: S. Low, Marston, 1895; reissued Patna: Academica Asiatica, 1973), pp. 178–179.
- 17 Muḥammad Yār QATAGHĀN, *Musakhkhir al-bilād* (ca. 1606), ed. Nādir JALĀLĪ (Tehran: Mīrāth-i maktūb, 1387/ 2008–2009), p. 217.

Khuttalān,<sup>18</sup> a settlement in the vicinity of Kulāb,<sup>19</sup> situated approximately eighty miles south-southeast of modern Dushanbe. Regardless of Mahdī's exact posting, it is apparent that the gubernatorial authority of the two brothers remained largely confined to the Ḥiṣār region for the first year or so after their appointments. Thereafter, however, the scope of their authority expanded. 1504 saw the death in Qunduz of Muḥammad Shībānī's brother Maḥmūd Sultan,<sup>20</sup> who for the previous year had also been his gubernatorial appointee to Badakhshan, a mountainous region varyingly conceptualised by contemporaries but generally agreed to extend from Qunduz to the loop of the Kūkchā river in the northeast of modern Afghanistan. Although sources relate that a certain Amīr Qanbār was appointed as Maḥmūd Sultan's gubernatorial successor,<sup>21</sup> it was Ḥamzah and his son Maṭlab – Tīmūr Sultan's brother – who took charge of the situation soon after when the afore-mentioned Khusraw Shāh made an attempt to recapture Qunduz.<sup>22</sup> According to one later Safavid history it was Ḥamzah also who in 1507 together with Mahdī took charge of gathering forces from Khaylān, Khuttalān, Qunduz and Bāghlān to participate in Muḥammad Shībānī's campaign into western Khurāsān.<sup>23</sup>

In 1508, Muḥammad Shībānī reconfirmed Ḥamzah and Mahdī in their holdings around Ḥiṣār, as part of a larger reallocation of territories across the khanate.<sup>24</sup> But the authority of Ḥamzah and Mahdī did not last long. In 1510, Muḥammad Shībānī's forces suffered a disastrous defeat at the hands of Shah

18 Ḥājji Mīr MUḤAMMAD-SALĪM, *Silsilat al-salāṭīn* (ca. 1747), MS Bodleian Ouseley 269, f. 112a.

19 For its location, see e.g. Maḥmūd b. Amīr WALI, *Baḥr al-asrār*, ed. Dr. WĀHIDI, *Āriyānā* 32.3, pp. 103–121 [p. 107].

20 Muḥammad ṢĀLIḤ, *Shībānī-nāmah*, pp. 370–386; *Mihmān-nāmah-yi Bukhārā*, p. 284; *Zubdat al-āthār* f. 476a; discussion in MUKMINOVA, *K istorii agrarnykh otnoshenii v Uzbekistane XVI v. Vakf-Name*. (Tashkent: Nauka, 1966), p. 14.

21 BINĀ'Ī, *Shībānī-nāmah*, p. 81, Muḥammad ṢĀLIḤ, *Shībānī-nāmah*, p. 386 (identifying Mahdi as his co-governor); *Mihmān-nāmah-yi Bukhārā*, p. 73; *Zubdat al-āthār*, f. 477a; *Baḥr al-asrār*, MS IVANRUZ 7418, f. 305a.

22 Muḥammad ṢĀLIḤ, *Shībānī-nāmah*, pp. 410, 420–426; *Zubdat al-āthār*, f. 476b; *Baḥr al-asrār*, MS IVANRUZ 7418, f. 294a. Maṭlab Sultan's army was later reinforced with forces dispatched by 'Ubaydallāh b. Maḥmūd in Bukhara and Tīmūr Sultan b. Muḥammad Shībānī in Samarqand.

23 Ḥasan Bīk RÜMLÜ, *Aḥsan al-tawārīkh* (ca. 1577), ed. C. N. SEDDON as *Ahsan al-tawārīkh of Ḥasan Beg Rūmlū being a Chronicle of the early Safavis* (Baroda: Oriental Institute, 1931), I. 97.

24 *Mihmān-nāmah-yi Bukhārā*, pp. 3–4; *Sharaf-nāmah-yi shāhī*, I. 82.

Isma‘īl’s Qizilbāsh army near Merv, in modern Turkmenistan, in the course of which Muḥammad Shībānī himself was captured and subsequently executed.<sup>25</sup> In Badakhshan, the Tīmūrid dynast Mīrẓā Khān took advantage of this setback and re-established for himself the authority previously enjoyed by his father, Sultan Maḥmūd b. Abū Sa‘īd, prior to the Uzbek invasion. Mīrẓā Khān would continue to rule Badakhshan until his death in 1520/1.<sup>26</sup> In Ḥiṣār, meanwhile, Ḥamzah’s authority survived just a little longer. Among accounts of the revised gubernatorial dispositions undertaken in the wake of Muḥammad Shībānī’s death, we find mention in one work that immediately following the battle of Merv Ḥamzah and Maḥdī were re-confirmed in their Ḥiṣārī holdings.<sup>27</sup> Within a year of their re-appointment, however, Ḥiṣār like Badakhshan fell to Tīmūrid attack. On this occasion, the aggressor was not Mīrẓā Khān but his cousin Bābur b. ‘Umar Shaykh. Approaching Ḥiṣār from the south, Bābur took Ḥamzah and Maḥdī prisoner. He then put them to death.<sup>28</sup>

After the deaths of Ḥamzah and Maḥdī, Ḥiṣār evidently remained under Tīmūrid rule for several years. Following his capture of the region, Bābur based himself in Ḥiṣār for a year or two before heading west to join forces with the Safavids in an attempt to expel the Uzbeks from Mā warā al-nahr. This campaign was not the success that Bābur had plainly hoped for. Defeated by Uzbek forces at Ghijduwān, just to the east of Bukhara, Bābur fled back to Ḥiṣār and thence to Kabul, from where he would subsequently embark upon his momen-

25 *Zubdat al-āthār*, ff. 478b–479a; Ghīyāth al-Dīn b. Humām al-Dīn Muḥammad KHWĀNDAMĪR, *Ḥabīb al-siyār fī akhbār afrad al-bashār* (1520–1524), ed. Şinasi TEKIN / Gönül Alpay TEKIN, tr. W. M. THACKSTON, (Harvard: Harvard University Press, 1994), p. 592; Sadr al-Dīn Sultan Ibrāhīm AMĪNĪ, *Futūḥāt-i Shāhī* (1531), ed. Muḥammad Riḍā NAŞĪRĪ (Tehran: Anjuman-i Āthār wa mufākhir-i farhangī, 1383/2004–2005), p. 334; Amīr Maḥmūd b. KHWĀNDAMĪR, *Tārīkh-i Shāh Isma‘īl-i awwāl wa Shāh Tahmāsb* (1542), ed. Ghulam-Riḍā ṬABAṬABĀ‘Ī (Tehran: Nashr-i gustarah, 1370/1991–1992), p. 69; ZAYN AL-‘ĀBIDĪN ‘ALĪ SHĪRĀZĪ NAYSHĀBŪRĪ, *Takmilat al-akhbār* (ca. 1570), ed. ‘ABD AL-ḤUSAYN NAWĀ‘Ī (Tehran: Mīrāth-i maktūb, 1369/1990–91), p. 160; *Aḥsan al-tawārīkh*, I. 118–123.

26 *Ḥabīb al-Siyār* p. 593, *Futūḥāt-i Shāhī* p. 357, *Tārīkh-i Rashīdī* pp. 220–221, *Aḥsan al-tawārīkh* I.127, all telling of his “appointment” to authority over the region by Shāh Isma‘īl. His authority is discussed in e.g. Dickson, “Shah Tahmasb and the Uzbeks,” p. 49, and T. G. ABAEVA, *Ocherki istorii Badakhshana* (Tashkent: Fan, 1964), p. 102.

27 *Zubdat al-āthār*, f. 479b.

28 *Ibid*, f. 480b; *Sharaf-nāmah-yi shāhī*, I.85. The claim by Arminius VÁMBÉRY, in *History of Bokhara from the Earliest Period down to the Present* (London: Henry S. King and Co., 1873), p. 279, that Ḥamzah was still alive in 1528 should be disregarded.

tous campaign into India.<sup>29</sup> But Bābur's precipitate flight into Afghanistan does not appear to have ended the period of Tīmūrid dominion in Ḥiṣār: according to Safavid tradition, this latter region now fell under the sway of Mīrzā Khān, the Tīmūrid ruler of Badakhshan.<sup>30</sup>

By some point in the 1520s, however, Ḥiṣār had evidently reverted to Uzbek rule. According to a passage in the *Baḥr al-asrār*, a universal history from the mid seventeenth century, around this time the ruler of Bukhara 'Ubaydallāh b. Maḥmūd appointed an associate to act as his governor in the region.<sup>31</sup> Although we lack a precise date for Ḥiṣār's recapture from Tīmūrid control, one possibility is that it occurred in 1526, when an Uzbek campaign from Mā warā al-nahr into north-eastern Khurāsān succeeded in expelling a Tīmūrid garrison from Balkh:<sup>32</sup> over the course of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, Balkh and Ḥiṣār were regularly selected as consecutive military targets,<sup>33</sup> and in the absence of further evidence we may hazard that in 1526 this was also the case. The author of the *Baḥr al-asrār*, Maḥmūd b. Amīr Walī, pro-

29 FADL-ALLĀH b. Rūzbihān Khunjī IṢFAHĀNĪ, *Sulūk al-mulūk* (ca. 1514), MS BL Or. 253, ff. 7b–8b; Zayn AL-DĪN WĀṢIFĪ, *Badā'i' al-waqā'i'* (ca. 1538), ed. A. N. BOLDYREV (2 vols., Tehran: Chāpkhānah-yi Zar, 1349/1970–1971), I. 112–118; Sayyid Khwājah Bahā al-Dīn Ḥasan Bukhārī 'NITHĀRĪ', *Mudhakkir al-aḥbāb* (ca. 1566), ed. N. M. HARAWĪ (Tehran: Nashr-i markaz, 1377/1998–1999), p. 17; *Sharaf-nāmah-yi shāhī*, I. 87.

30 See e.g. MĪRZĀ BIK b. Ḥasan Junābādī, *Rawḍat al-Ṣafawīyyah* (ca. 1616), ed. G.-R. ṬABĀTABĀ'Ī MAJD (Tehran: Majmū'ah-yi intishārāt-i adabī wa tārikhī-yi mawqūfāt-i Duktūr Maḥmūd Afshār Yazdī, 1378/1999–2000), p. 247, and Walī QULĪ SHĀMLŪ ibn Dā'ūd Qulī, *Qīṣaṣ al-khāqānī* (ca. 1666), ed. Ḥasan SĀDĀT-I NĀṢIRĪ (Tehran: Sāzmān-i chāp wa intishārāt-i wizārāt-i farhang wa irshād-i islāmī, 1371–1374/1992–1995) I. 43. For Mīrzā Khān, see M. DICKSON, "Shāh Tahmāsb and the Uzbeks: The Duel for Khurasān with 'Ubayd Khān 930–946/1524–1540" (Princeton University Ph.D dissertation, 1958), pp. 47–49; ABAEVA, *Ocherki istorii Badakhshana*, p. 102; and AKHMEDOV, "Poslednie Timuridy i bor'ba za Badakhshan." In: P. G. BULGAKOV / I. KARIMOV (eds.), *Issledovaniia po istorii, istorii Nauki i kul'tury narodov Srednei Azii* (Tashkent: Fan, 1993), pp. 82–98 [p. 90].

31 Cited in AKHMEDOV, *Istoriia Balkha* (Tashkent: Fan, 1982), p. 71; followed in turn in V. FOURNIAU, "Irrigation et nomadisme pastoral en Asie Centrale: La Politique d'implantation des Ouzbeks au XVI siècle." *Central Asian Survey* 4.2 (1985): 1–39 [p. 12].

32 DICKSON, "Shāh Tahmāsb and the Uzbeks," pp. 80–84; AKHMEDOV, *Istoriia Balkha*, pp. 78–79.

33 Note e.g. sequential Balkh / Ḥiṣār campaigns undertaken by 'Abdallāh b. Iskandar in 1572–1573 (see below in this article, pp. 816–817) and by the incoming Tūqāy-Tīmūrid ruler Bāqī Muḥammad b. Jānī Muḥammad in 1600 (see e.g. WELSFORD, "Loyalty, Welfare and Selfhood in Early-Modern Central Asia: The Tūqāy-Tīmūrid Takeover of Greater Mā warā al-nahr, 1598–1605" (Oxford University D.Phil thesis, 2007), pp. 194–200).

vides us with somewhat more information about the individual whom ‘Ubayd-allāh selected as Ḥiṣāri governor. He identifies him as Ḥamzah’s son ‘Abd al-Maṭlab.<sup>34</sup>

About ‘Abd al-Maṭlab there is not much to say, except that he is presumably to be identified with the afore-mentioned Maṭlab b. Ḥamzah whose previous activities in Qunduz we noted above. We know little about his period of office in Ḥiṣār save that it had come to an end by ca. 1533. This is evident from an Ottoman intelligence report composed around this time, providing information about the disposition of administrative authority across the territories of the Uzbek khanate. Rather than Maṭlab b. Ḥamzah, we find the ruler of Ḥiṣār here given as a certain Burunduq,<sup>35</sup> who in turn can be identified by material in the *Sharaf-nāmah-yi Shāhī* as another of Ḥamzah’s sons.<sup>36</sup> When, by the mid 1540s at the very latest, Tīmūr Sultan – otherwise known, of course, as Tīmūr Aḥmad – acceded to authority, he was thus at least the third of Ḥamzah b. Bakhtiyār’s sons sequentially to exercise this office. In early sixteenth-century Central Asia, the authority which Bakhtiyār’s descendents enjoyed in Ḥiṣār evidently differed little from the authority enjoyed further west by their Abū’l-Khayrid kinsmen.

### 3. Family Status

Nor in early sixteenth-century Central Asia does the authority of Bakhtiyār’s descendents seem to have been *conceptualized* differently from that of their Abū’l-Khayrid kinsmen. Our early sixteenth-century sources make little distinction in the rhetorical treatment which they accord respectively to the Abū’l-Khayrids descended from Dawlat Shaykh b. Ibrāhīm and to the Ḥiṣāris descended from Bakhtiyār b. Khiḍr b. Ibrāhīm.

This is particularly true of the treatment accorded to Ḥamzah and Maḥdī. Telling, for instance, is a passage in the *Mihmān-nāmah-yi Bukhārā*, a Persian-language work composed by Faḍl-Allāh b. Rūzbihān Khunjī in 1509 and largely devoted to Muḥammad Shībānī’s campaign that year into territories north of the Syr Darya. The passage in question relates how in 1508 Muḥammad Shībānī confirmed Ḥamzah and Maḥdī in their Ḥiṣāri holdings, at the same time as he

34 AKHMEDOV, *Istoriia Balkha*, p. 71, as above.

35 J. L. BACQUÉ-GRAMMONT, “Une liste ottomane de princes et d’apanages Abu’l-Khayrides.” *CMRS* 11 (1970): 423–453 [pp. 430–431], reproducing Topkapı document E. 1291.

36 *Sharaf-nāmah-yi shāhī*, I. 76.

confirmed his uncles Kūchkūnjī and Suyūnch Khwājah and his cousin Jānī Bīk b. Khwājah Muḥammad in authority respectively over Turkistān, Tashkent and Andijān. The passage is instructive for two reasons. First is that the honorific titulature accorded to Ḥamzah and Mahdī differs little from that accorded to their Abū'l-Khayrid contemporaries. Kūchkūnjī is described as a *sulṭān-i mu'aẓẓam*, *malik-i mukarram*, Suyūnch Khwājah as a *sulṭān-i shajā'at-āthār*, *najābat-āthār*, *malik-i nāmdār*, and Jānī Bīk as a *pādishāh-i mu'aẓẓam*, *sulṭān-i mu'aẓẓam*; Ḥamzah meanwhile, is described as a *sulṭān-i rif'at-shi'ār*, *'aẓamat-āthār*, and Mahdī as his *barādar-i mukarram-i nāmdār-i jalīl al-miqdār*. The second point of interest is the order in which the confirmations of authority are related: first is that of Kūchkūnjī, the second that of Suyūnch Khwājah and the third that of Ḥamzah and Mahdī, with Jānī Bīk's confirmation of authority following immediately thereafter. This sequence of accounts suggests that Khunjī ascribed little taxonomical salience to the distinction between dynasts of Abū'l-Khayrid and of Bakhtiyārid ancestry.<sup>37</sup>

This is of course a little different from that account of the protocol offered by Binā'ī, in his *Shībānī-nāmah* of ca 1510. Relating the distribution of appointments, Binā'ī notes Muḥammad Shībānī's grant of Ḥiṣār to Ḥamzah and Mahdī after the afore-mentioned grants made to Kūchkūnjī, Suyūnch Khwājah and Jānī Bīk, and instead alongside some of the more minor grants made to junior Abū'l-Khayrid dynasts and non-Chinggīsid *amīrs*.<sup>38</sup> Binā'ī's account of the protocol thereafter served as a model for Ḥāfiẓ-i Tānīsh, writing in the *Sharaf-nāmah-yi shāhī* towards the end of the sixteenth century, and presenting Ḥamzah as merely one of the many to hold appointed office under Muḥammad Shībānī.<sup>39</sup> Although Binā'ī's *Shībānī-nāmah* thus served as a model for elements of the *Sharaf-nāmah-yi shāhī* narrative, however, Binā'ī's portrayal of Ḥamzah is substantially different from that offered by the later writer. Unlike in the *Sharaf-nāmah-yi shāhī*, where he is little more than a name in a list, in the *Shībānī-nāmah* Ḥamzah is a figure of considerable agency. On one occasion, Binā'ī relates how, during the invasion, Ḥamzah dared to criticize Muḥammad Shībānī Khan's proposed plan of campaign, persuading him to adopt in its place a better thought-out alternative: exemplifying as it does a widely-attested concern amongst our early

37 *Mihmān-nāmah-yi Bukhārā*, pp. 3–4.

38 BINĀ'Ī, *Shībānī-nāmah*, p. 81.

39 *Sharaf-nāmah-yi shāhī*, I. 82.



sixteenth-century sources for the merits of consultative kingship,<sup>40</sup> it sits uneasily alongside those more hieratic notions of kingship from the later sixteenth century, and is duly omitted from the later sixteenth-century narrative tradition.

Several other early sources similarly accord Ḥamzah and Maḥdī a status which is denied them in later sixteenth-century materials. One of these is the *Zubdat al-āthār*, a Chinggisid dynastic history composed by ‘Abdallāh b. Muḥammad Naṣr-Allāh in ca. 1525. It is this work which contains the above-noted report that Ḥamzah and Maḥdī were confirmed in office immediately upon the arrival of news from Merv, thus at the same time that ‘Ubaydallāh b. Maḥmūd received appanage authority over Bukhara.<sup>41</sup> Later sources, however, make no reference to any such events. In the *Sharaf-nāmah-yi shāhī*, for instance, Ḥāfiẓ-i Tānīsh mentions no administrative protocol from 1508 until 1512, when Jānī Bīk b. Khwājah Muḥammad presided over a territorial reallocation in the wake of his victory against Bābur’s Tīmūrid forces at Ghijduwān. By the terms of this latter reallocation, Ḥāfiẓ-i Tānīsh relates, ‘Ubaydallāh received Bukhara, Kūchkūnjī Samarqand, Suyūnch Khwājah Tashkent and Turkistān, and Jānī Bīk himself the region of Miyānkāl and Karmīnah.<sup>42</sup> The descendents of Bakhtiyār b. Khidr, meanwhile, received nothing: by 1512 Ḥamzah and Maḥdī had of course been put to death by Bābur, and the region of Ḥiṣār with which they had become associated now lay under Tīmūrid rule. By recounting his narrative as he does, Ḥāfiẓ-i Tānīsh effectively airbrushes the Ḥiṣāri ruling line from the events of 1510–1512.

Relating directly to these events is a further early source which similarly accords the Ḥiṣāri dynast parity of status with his Abū’l-Khayrid kinsmen. Within the grounds of Muḥammad Shībānī’s mausoleum in Samarqand, there survive two funerary inscriptions dedicated to Ḥamzah – identified here as Abū’l-Naṣr Sultan Ḥamzah Bahādur – and his son Abū’l-Khayr, who in 1512 died alongside Ḥamzah at Bābur’s hands.<sup>43</sup> The formulae with which these two individuals are memorialised are indistinguishable from that accorded to the likes of the Abū’l-Khayrid dynast Tīmūr Muḥammad b. Muḥammad Shībānī, whose memorial in-

40 For further discussion of this trope see KILIÇ, “Change in Political Culture,” p. 59.

41 *Zubdat al-āthār*, f. 479b, as above.

42 *Sharaf-nāmah-yi shāhī*, I. 86–87; discussion in DICKSON, “Shāh Ṭahmāsb and the Uzbegs,” pp. 35–36.

43 As a further caution about the dangers of relying on late sixteenth-century sources, one observes that the *Sharaf-nāmah-yi shāhī* fails to make any mention of Abū’l-Khayr among Ḥamzah’s descendents.

scription lies alongside their own:<sup>44</sup> of Abū'l-Khayr b. Ḥamzah, for instance, it is recorded that he was “the quintessence of khans”.<sup>45</sup> Like the *Zubdat al-āthār*, these inscriptions thus offer a useful corrective to prevailing late sixteenth-century tradition, making clear as it does that even in the wake of the events of 1510–1512, members of the Ḥiṣārī line remained firmly within the ruling khanal party. The fact, as related in the *Baḥr al-asrār*, that upon the Uzbek recapture of Ḥiṣār ‘Ubaydallāh b. Maḥmūd restored Ḥamzah’s son ‘Abd al-Maṭlab to his father’s former office suggests, furthermore, that even after the Tīmūrid interregnum members of the Ḥiṣārī line continued to be regarded as members of the *dawlat-i khāqānī*: and that it was only subsequently that they came to be excluded therefrom.

Nor is it clear exactly when later in the sixteenth century this process of exclusion from the *dawlat-i khāqānī* occurred. The afore-mentioned passage from the *Jāddat al-‘āshiqīn* would suggest, of course, that by the mid-1550s members of the Ḥiṣārī line were clearly excluded from an Abū'l-Khayrid ruling collective. But a somewhat different impression accrues from the *Mir’āt al-mamālik*, an account by the Ottoman admiral and traveler Sīdī ‘Alī Ra’īs of his journey west through Central Asia between 1554 and 1557. Describing his sojourn at the court of Tīmūr Sultan in Ḥiṣār, Sīdī ‘Alī Ra’īs notes that his host boasted the title of ‘*qagālghā*’.<sup>46</sup> This appears to be a variant on ‘*qalghā*’, a term which is widely recorded throughout the sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Chinggisid world, denoting the consensually anticipated successor of a ruling khan.<sup>47</sup> If one accepts this reading – and the proliferation of attested ortho-

44 B. BABAJANOV / A. MUMINOV / J. PAUL, *Schaibanidische Grabinschriften* (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1997), pp. 67–71. I am grateful to Jürgen Paul for directing me to this reference.

45 *Ibid.*, p. 68.

46 Sīdī ‘ALĪ RA’ĪS, *Mir’āt al-mamālik* (ca. 1558), ed. M. KIREMIT as *Mir’ātü’l-memâlik* (Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu Yayınları, 1999), p. 129.

47 For discussion of the term, see V. V. VEL’IAMINOV-ZERNOV, *Issledovanie o kasimovskikh tsariakh i tsarevichakh*, in *TVOIRAO* 10 (2 vols., 1863–1864), II. 348–349; P. PELLIOU, *Notes sur l’histoire de la Horde d’Or*, pp. 204–206; H. İNALCIK, “Kalgay”, in *IA* VI, pp. 131–132; J. MATUZ, “Qalğa”, *Turcica* 2 (1970): 103–129; A. BENNIGSEN / C. LEMERCIER-QUELQUEJAY, “La Moscovie, l’Empire ottoman et la crise successorale de 1577–1588 dans le khanat de Crimée. La tradition nomade contre le modèle des monarchies sédentaires,” *Cahiers du Monde Russe et Soviétique* 14.4 (1973): 453–487 [p. 455]; B. F. MANZ, “The Clans of the Crimean Khanate, 1466–1532,” *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 2.iii (1978): 281–309 [p. 294]; BENNIGSEN / P. N. BORATAV / D. DESAIEV / LEMERCIER-QUELQUEJAY, *Le Khanat de Crimée* (Paris: Mouton, 1978), pp. 395–396; and U. SCHAMILOGLU, “Tribal



graphic variants on ‘*qalghā*’ suggests that this is reasonable<sup>48</sup> – the implications are striking. They suggest that not only did the Ḥiṣāri Tīmūr Sultan continue into the mid-1550s to be deemed – in certain circles, at least – a member of the *dawlat-i khāqānī*, but that within the ruling collective he furthermore enjoyed a position of distinction, as anticipated khanal successor of either Nawrūz Aḥmad b. Suyūnch Muḥammad (r. 1552–1556) or, less probably, Pīr Muḥammad b. Sulaymān (r. 1556–1561), to which few Abū’l-Khayrids could aspire.<sup>49</sup>

In the light of all this, one begins to wonder how helpful it is, when discussing the early sixteenth-century Abū’l-Khayrid khanate, to conceptualise the khanate as an exclusively Abū’l-Khayrid formation. The acknowledged presence of the Ḥiṣāris within this political order suggests that the early sixteenth-century ruling collective was more extensive than either Ḥāfīz-i Tānīsh or Martin Dickson would allow: and that, far from existing as a corporate entity *ab initio* from the time of Muḥammad Shībānī’s conquest, the ‘Abū’l-Khayrid khanate’ as conceptualised in the latter half of the sixteenth-century itself resulted from a process of dynastic shift and exclusion. This was a process to which the Ḥiṣāris were amongst the first to fall victim.

#### 4. The Collapse of Consensus

In 958/1551–1552, Tīmūr Sultan’s former guest Shaykh Kamāl al-Dīn Ḥusayn Khwārazmī died while on the *ḥajj*. That same year saw a major assault on the existing disposition of power in Mā warā al-nahr. On this occasion the assault came not from the ruler of Ḥiṣār, but from that very person whose authority

---

Politics and Social Organization in the Golden Horde” (1986: Ph.D. dissertation, Columbia University), p. 59.

48 See e.g. J. SENKOWSKI, *Supplément à l’histoire générale des Huns, des Turcs et des Mogols, contenant un abrégé de l’histoire de la domination des Uzbèks dans la Grande Bukharie, depuis leur établissement dans ce pays jusqu’à l’an 1709, et une continuation de l’histoire de Kharèzm, depuis la mort d’Aboul-ghazi-khan jusqu’à la même époque* (St. Petersburg: Imprimerie de l’Académie Impériale des Sciences, 1824), pp. 23, 25 and 68.

49 Of course, it might be objected that, in referring to Tīmūr Sultan as *qagālghā*, Sīdī ‘Alī Ra’īs was reflecting a merely Ḥiṣāri usage, and that Tīmūr Sultan’s titulature may have held little currency in the Abū’l-Khayrid lands to the west. But in such circumstances one might have expected Sīdī ‘Alī Ra’īs’ subsequent informers in Shahrīsabz, Samarqand and elsewhere along his route to have pointed up Tīmūr Sultan’s pretension.

Shihāb al-Dīn Khwārazmī accuses Tīmūr Sultan of recently having challenged. Acting in collaboration with his Tashkent-based first cousin Nawrūz Aḥmad b. Suyūnch Muḥammad b. Abū'l-Khayr, 'Abd al-Laṭīf b. Kūchkūnjī b. Abū'l-Khayr led a campaign against two other cousinly parties exercising appanage authority elsewhere within the khanate. The first of these was Burhān b. Muḥammad Raḥīm Sultan b. 'Ubaydallāh b. Shāh Budāq b. Abū'l-Khayr, ruler of Bukhara; the second were a group of descendents of Jānī Bīk b. Khwājah Muḥammad b. Abū'l-Khayr whom 'Abd al-Laṭīf succeeded in expelling from Miyānkāl, between Bukhara and Samarqand, where they had been appanaged for much of the early sixteenth century.<sup>50</sup> This was not the first time that the workings of the Abū'l-Khayrid ruling collective had come under pressure: in 1546/7 internecine rivalries between descendents of Jānī Bīk b. Khwājah Muḥammad had resulted in the overthrow of the incumbent appanage-holder in Balkh,<sup>51</sup> and around this same time Bukhara had been the site of contestation for power between Burhān b. Muḥammad Raḥīm Sultan and Yār Muḥammad, a fellow descendent of Shāh Budāq b. Abū'l-Khayr.<sup>52</sup> With this escalating breakdown of dynastic solidarity, Tīmūr Sultan in Ḥiṣār might have been forgiven for uncertainty as to what, in the middle years of the sixteenth century, the *dawlat-i khāqānī* actually constituted.

From 1551–1552 onwards, intra-Abū'l-Khayrid tensions sharply worsened. Acceding to supreme khanal authority after the death of 'Abd al-Laṭīf in 1552, in the following year Nawrūz Aḥmad captured Samarqand from 'Abd al-Laṭīf's fellow Kūchkūnjīd descendents, and forced the incumbent Sultān Sa'īd into exile in Kashgar.<sup>53</sup> By the early 1560s, however, the major challenge to any surviving concept of a single Abū'l-Khayrid ruling collective was coming not from descendents of Suyūnch Muḥammad but rather from that sub-family of Abū'l-Khayrids descended from the afore-mentioned Jānī Bīk b. Khwājah Muḥammad. As has been well related by Robert McChesney and Audrey Burton, over the following three decades members of this sub-family came increasingly to monopolise political authority across Mā warā al-nahr at the expense of those outside

50 *Aḥsan al-tawārīkh* I. 397; *Sharaf-nāmah-yi shāhī*, I. 132–135. Discussion in SCHWARZ, “*Unser Weg schließt Tausend Wege ein*”, p. 82.

51 *Musakhkhir al-bilād*, p. 185.

52 M. A. SALAKHETDINOVA, “Nekotorye dannye o politicheskoi zhizni Bukhary v seredine XVI v. i ob uchastii v nei Turkmen.” In: G. F. GIRS (ed.), *Srednevekovyi vostok: istoriia, kul'tura, istochnikovedenie* (Moscow, 1980), pp. 237–241.

53 *Sharaf-nāmah-yi shāhī*, I. 180.

their dynastic subgroup.<sup>54</sup> The dominant figure behind this movement was ‘Abdallāh b. Iskandar b. Jānī Bīk, who in 1561 secured his father’s khalaf elevation in the formerly Shāh-Budāqid holding of Bukhara. Both in the years prior to his own khalaf succession in 1583 and in the years thereafter, ‘Abdallāh continued to target not only the Kūchkūnjids in Samarqand and the Suyūnchids in the territories north of the Syr Darya river, but also those other non-Abū’l-Khayrid regimes which bordered the heartland of Mā warā al-nahr. The rulers of Ḥiṣār comprised just one of the parties which had the misfortune to constitute a target for ‘Abdallāh’s expansionist ambitions. The awareness of this fact did much to determine the course of Ḥiṣārī external relations in the later sixteenth century. It also did much to determine the Ḥiṣārī regime’s subsequent depiction by Bukharan chroniclers.

## 5. The Jānī Bīkid Threat

From the mid sixteenth century onwards, the Ḥiṣārī regime’s conduct of external relations seems to have been guided above all by hostility to, and fear of, the Bukharan Jānī Bīkids. This was a novelty. For much of the first half of the sixteenth century, relations between Ḥiṣār and its various western neighbours were unproblematic. The regular issue of local coins in the name first of Kūchkūnjī<sup>55</sup> and then of ‘Abd al-Laṭīf<sup>56</sup> suggests that the Ḥiṣārīs continued usually, at least, to recognize the sovereignty of their Abū’l-Khayrid cousins; mention of how in 1538 two grandsons of Ḥamzah assisted the Bukharan khan ‘Ubaydallāh b. Maḥmūd in that year’s campaign against the Khwārazmians suggests that they

54 R. D. MCCHESENEY, *Waqf in Central Asia: Four Hundred Years in the History of a Muslim Shrine, 1480–1889* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1991), pp. 62–66; A. BURTON, *The Bukharans – A Dynastic, Diplomatic and Commercial History 1550–1702* (Richmond, Surrey: Curzon, 1997), pp. 8–45.

55 N. M. LOWICK, “Shaybānid Silver Coins,” *The Numismatic Chronicle* 7.6 (1966): 251–330 [pp. 265, 319]; E. A. DAVIDOVICH, “O lokal’nykh variantakh razvitiia tovarno-denezhnykh otnoshenii v IX–XVI vv. (na primere iuzhnogo Tadzhikistana)” in *Tovarno-denezhnye otnosheniia na Blizhnem i Srednem Vostoke v epokhu srednevekov’ia* (Moscow: Nauka, 1979), pp. 69–87 [p. 79]; *idem*, *Istoriia Denezhnogo Obrashcheniia Srednevekovoi Srednei Azii*, pp. 306–307; and *idem*, *Klady drevnykh i srednevekovykh monet Tadzhikistana* (Moscow: Nauka, 1979) pp. 359, 377, 379 (hoards 75–77).

56 LOWICK, “Shaybānid Silver Coins,” pp. 265, 284–285, 287 and 322; and DAVIDOVICH, *Klady drevnykh i srednevekovykh monet Tadzhikistana*, p. 323.

were furthermore willing to comply with the practical demands attendant on office.<sup>57</sup>

Nor during the early years of Tīmūr Sultan's reign does the regime appear to have been concerned about any threat from the west: if anything, around this time the Ḥiṣārīs appear to have been signally more assertive than their neighbours. At least two sources attest to Tīmūr's territorial ambitions towards Badakhshan, which in the mid sixteenth century was still subject to Tīmūrid authority, now in the person of Mīrzā Khān's son Shāh Sulaymān. In the early seventeenth-century *Akbar-nāmah*, the Mughal historian 'Abū'l-Faḍl 'Allāmī notes the activities of a certain son of the Ḥiṣārī dynast 'Abbās Sultan,<sup>58</sup> "who was continually coming from Ḥiṣār and making forays [into Badakhshan] on behalf of Tīmūr Khan who was the ruler of Ḥiṣār, and was his cousin".<sup>59</sup> Evidence for Ḥiṣārī ambitions in the Badakhshan region comes also from an Istanbul document from ca. 1550. In this document, it is related that the Mughal prince Humāyūn b. Bābur suffered a major reverse in the late 1540s when, venturing into the region of Kāhmard in northern Badakhshan, he was attacked by Tīmūr Sultan's nephew Shāh Muḥammad b. Burunduq.<sup>60</sup>

The later years of Tīmūr Sultan's reign, however, saw a change of focus, as Tīmūr Sultan increasingly directed his attentions and efforts towards his feuding Abū'l-Khayrid neighbours, and particularly towards the ascendant party of Jānī Bīkids. What he may initially have regarded as a competition for intra-dynastic prestige would end as a doomed fight for survival.

If Tīmūr Sultan's unauthorized issue of the *khuṭbah* and the *sikkah* can be read as one particular assertion of prestige, his cultivation of relations with Kamāl al-Dīn Ḥusayn Khwārazmī can be read as another, allowing him as it did to demonstrate that he enjoyed sufficient resources to entice to Ḥiṣār so eminent

57 N. I. VESELOVSKII, *Ocherk istoriko-geograficheskikh svedenii o khivinskom khanstva ot drevneishikh vremen do nastoiashchogo* (St Petersburg: Tipografiia brat. Panteleevykh, 1877), p. 106.

58 *Mir'āt al-mamālik*, p. 129, identifies 'Abbās Sultan as the son of Ḥamzah, and thus a brother of Tīmūr Sultan; the afore-mentioned late IVANRUZ *Ughūz-nāmah* suggests that 'Abbās Sultān was the son of Matlab Sultān b. Hamzah, and therefore Tīmūr Sultan's nephew.

59 Abū'l-Faḍl 'ALLĀMĪ, *Akbar-nāmah* (ca. 1601) tr. H. BEVERIDGE (3 vols., Calcutta: The Asiatic Society of Bengal, 1907–1939), II, 189.

60 BACQUÉ-GRAMMONT, "Les affaires Mogholes vues par un ambassadeur Özbek à Istanbul vers 1550." In: Ch. LEMERCIER-QUELQUEJAY / V. VEINSTEIN / W.E. WIMBUSH (eds.), *Passé Turco-Tatar, Présent Soviétique – Études offertes à Alexandre Bennigsen* (Paris: Éditions Peeters, 1986), pp. 165–173 [p. 173].

a shaykh. Nor was Kamāl al-Dīn Ḥusayn Khwārazmī the only such notable shaykh who spent time at the mid sixteenth-century Ḥiṣārī court: in an Ottoman-language devotional work entitled the *Jawāhir al-abrār*, the Yasawī mystic Hazīnī, for instance, relates that he spent time at Ḥiṣār before heading west to Istanbul.<sup>61</sup> Commenting upon the nature of relationships between secular and spiritual authority in sixteenth-century Central Asia, Florian Schwarz observes that such “Verbindungen sind nicht politisch [...] sondern mystisch”.<sup>62</sup> But Tīmūr Sultan’s choice of associates suggests that on occasion the distinction between the “political” and the “mystical” might be a narrow one. From the 1550s onwards, Tīmūr Sultan was particularly eager to cultivate relations with Sufī figures who, like him, were on cool terms with the Bukharan Jānī Bīkids.

Notable among these were two eminent members of the Naqshbandī brotherhood. The first such individual was Khwājah Luṭfullāh Chustī, a former associate of the famous Aḥmad Kāsānī. In the late sixteenth-century *Sirāj al-salākīn*, Muḥammad Rahīm recounts how at some point in the 1550s Luṭfullāh Chustī arrived in Ḥiṣār from the north, having spent some time previously at the court of Nawrūz Aḥmad in Tashkent;<sup>63</sup> during the later stages of his life Chustī spent time also particularly in the Suyūnchid strongholds of Andijan and Akhsī in the Ferghana valley.<sup>64</sup> Strikingly, however, after the mid 1540s he did not spend time in Bukhara and the central region of Mā warā al-nahr, even though this was where he had been based for much of the decade previously. Upon Aḥmad Kāsānī’s death in 1542, Luṭfullāh Chustī had made a bid to inherit his master’s spiritual mantle, but was beaten by the rival claims of a second associate called Khwājah Muḥammad Islām Juybārī. A Bukharan native, Muḥammad Islām enjoyed strong support from members of the Jānī-Bīkid faction of Abū’l-

61 ‘HAZĪNĪ’, *Jawāhir al-abrār* (ca. 1593), ed. and translit. C. OKUYUCU as *Cevāhiru’l-ebrār min emvâc-ı bihâr (Yesevî menâkıbnamesi)* (Kayseri: Erciyes Üniversitesi Yayınları, 1995), p. 186.

62 SCHWARZ, “*Unser Weg schließt tausend Wege ein*,” p. 161.

63 Muḥammad RAHĪM, *Sirāj al-sālīkīn*, MS IVANRUZ 629, ff. 104b–111a; discussion in T. M. ATAKHANOV, “Mavzolei Makhdumi A’zam v Gisare,” in: F.I. Pushkina (ed.), *Materialy po Arkheologii i Istorii Tadzhikistana* (Dushanbe: Donish, 1977), pp. 95–109 [pp. 106–107].

64 *Sirāj al-sālīkīn*, ff. 71a–b, 95b and elsewhere; also Muḥammad al-Muftī TĀSHKANDĪ-AHANGARĀNĪ, *Manāqib-i Mawlānā Luṭfullāh* (ca. 1572), excerpted in Uzbek translation as *Mavlono Lutfulloh Manoqibi* by A. MA’RUF XO’JA / Sh. SIROJIDDINOV (Tashkent: Imom al-Buxoriy halqaro jamg’armasi, 2002), pp. 37, 45 and elsewhere. For a discussion of Chustī’s activities see B. BABAJANOV, “Mawlānā Lutfulloh Chūstī – An Outline of his Hagiography and Political Activity,” *ZDMG* 149 (1999): 245–270; and SCHWARZ, “*Unser Weg schließt tausend Wege ein*,” pp. 174–185.

Khayrids.<sup>65</sup> Bested by Muḥammad Islām, and enjoying little favour among the Jānī-Bīkids, Luṭfullāh Chustī subsequently found preferment in the Bukhara region closed to him. He thereafter consequently directed his activities further afield where Bukharan political and spiritual authority held little sway, spending time among both the Suyūnchids and the Qazaqs of the Dasht-i Qipchāq, as well as with Tīmūr Sultan at Ḥiṣār.

The second notable Naqshbandī shaykh whom Tīmūr Sultan invited to spend time in Ḥiṣār was Khwājah Ishāq. Ishāq was a younger son of Aḥmad Kāsānī who, like Luṭfullāh Chustī, evidently aspired to succeed to his father's spiritual authority. Like Luṭfullāh Chustī also, once vanquished in his ambitions Ishāq spent much of the rest of his life traveling in regions where the authority of Muḥammad Islām Juybārī and the Jānī-Bīkids held little sway. His most famous place of sojourn was in Eastern Turkestan, where he is credited with founding a dynastic line of *khwājahs* which continued to exercise spiritual and political authority until the early nineteenth century.<sup>66</sup> Several late accounts of Ishāq's life fail to mention his activities anywhere other than Eastern Turkestan. In the *Ḍiyā al-qulūb*, however, Mullā Awāz reports that before heading across the Tian Shan Ishāq peregrinated widely through some of the marginal regions around the Abū'l-Khayrid khanate where Bukharan authority did not obtain. One such region was Balkh, where he was the guest of the local ruler Pīr Muḥammad b. Jānī Bīk, and another was Ḥiṣār. While in Balkh, Mullā Awāz relates, Ishāq was so assailed by people seeking association with him that he decided to go to Ḥiṣār in order to enjoy a period of ease; and was only too delighted to assent when Tīmūr Sultan soon after wrote inviting him to pay a visit.<sup>67</sup> He thus set off immediately after Pīr Muḥammad's death in 974/1566–1567.<sup>68</sup>

Around this time, Bukharan Jānī-Bīkid forces under 'Abdallāh b. Iskandar were making advances in the regions of both Nasaf and Samarqand. Faced with the danger of further Jānī-Bīkid expansion, Tīmūr Sultan opted to align the

65 For good general discussion, see SCHWARZ, "Unser Weg schließt tausend Wege ein," pp. 190–195.

66 See M. HARTMANN, "Ein Heiligenstaat im Islam: Das Ende der Čaghataiden und die Herrschaft der Choğas in Kašgarien," in: *Der Islamische Orient. Berichte und Forschungen I* (Berlin: Wolf Preiser Verlag, 1905), pp. 195–374; H. G. SCHWARZ, "The Khwājas of Eastern Turkestan," *Central Asiatic Journal* 20 (1976): 266–296; A. PAPAS, *Soufisme et politique entre Chine, Tibet et Turkestan: étude sur les Khwājas naqshbandis du Turkestan Oriental* (Paris: Maisonneuve, 2005).

67 MULLĀ AWĀZ, *Ḍiyā al-qulūb* (ca. 1603), MS StPOIVAN 3498, ff. 13b–14b.

68 Pīr Muḥammad's death is dated thus in *Musakhkhir al-bilād*, p. 187.



Ḥiṣāri regime with other parties for whom ‘Abdallāh was similarly a threat. Pre-eminent among these was the sub-family of Suyūnchid Abū’l-Khayrid dynasts, who after 1510 were established in appanage authority over Tashkent and the Turkestan region. A Ḥiṣāri-Suyūnchid alliance had already been in place for some time: having captured Mīyānkāl from the Jānī-Bīkids in 1551/2, for instance, the Suyūnchid Nawrūz Aḥmad Khan opted to entrust Tīmūr Sultan’s kinsman Hāshim Sultan<sup>69</sup> with the city of Kish/Shahrisabz, a settlement approximately seventy miles south of Samarqand, and just over a hundred miles west of Ḥiṣār.<sup>70</sup> Although Kish was soon recaptured by the Jānī-Bīkids and entrusted to ‘Ibādallāh Sultan,<sup>71</sup> the city remained an important front in the mid sixteenth-century appanage conflict, and together with their Suyūnchid allies the Ḥiṣāris long sought to prevent the city from becoming a Jānī-Bīkid bulkhead in the east of the khanate. In 1568, for instance, Hāshim and several of his kinsmen joined Bābā Sultan b. Nawrūz Aḥmad in an attempt to wrest the city from Jānī-Bīkid control.<sup>72</sup> Although this particular campaign proved unsuccessful, a little while later Hāshim’s brother Faqīr Sultan succeeded in establishing himself in control over Kish, where he remained until forced to retreat by Jānī-Bīkid forces in April 1569.<sup>73</sup>

Hāshim Sultan’s relations with the Suyūnchids were sufficiently close for the late sixteenth-century Bukharan chronicler and hagiographer Badr al-Dīn Kashmīrī to misidentify him as a Suyūnchid dynast.<sup>74</sup> But the Suyūnchids were not the only party with which the Ḥiṣāri regime made common cause in the face of external threat. Another was the Samarqand-based family of Kūchkūnjids, several of whom are known to have participated in Bābā Sultan’s afore-mentioned attempt on Kish in 1568. As we shall see, an alliance between the rulers of Ḥiṣār and the Suyūnchids and Kūchkūnjids would furthermore continue to outlive the Ḥiṣāri regime itself.

69 *Sharaf-nāmah-yi shāhī*, I. 76, identifies Hāshim as Tīmūr Sultan’s nephew. MUṬRIBĪ al-Aṣamm al-Samarqandī, *Tadhkirat al-shu‘arā* (ca. 1604), ed. A. JĀNFADĀ (Tehran: Mīrāth-i maktūb, 1377/1998–1999), p. 176, instead identifies him as Tīmūr Sultan’s son.

70 *Sharaf-nāmah-yi shāhī*, I. 164. The events are alluded to also in *Mīr’āt al-mamālik*, pp. 129–130. This may feasibly have been the occasion when coinage was issued in Tīmūr Sultan’s name.

71 *Sharaf-nāmah-yi shāhī*, I. 193–195; *Musakhkhir al-bilād*, p. 235.

72 *Sharaf-nāmah-yi shāhī*, II. 37.

73 *Sharaf-nāmah-yi shāhī*, II. 60–1; *Musakhkhir al-bilād*, pp. 263–264.

74 Badr al-Dīn KASHMĪRĪ, *Rawḍat al-riḍwān* (ca. 1589), MS IVANRUZ 2094, ff. 218a–219b and 346a.

The last of the Ḥiṣārī regime's allies against 'Abdallāh b. Iskandar were the Tīmūrīd rulers of Badakhshan. Given Tīmūr Sultan's own territorial ambitions in the Badakhshan region, the alliance was probably not an easy one. Given that access to both Ḥiṣār and Badakhshan was governed by control of the Amū Daryā littoral, however, the Ḥiṣārīs and the Badakhshanīs shared a common interest in preventing 'Abdallāh's southwards expansion towards Balkh. Like the Ḥiṣārīs, the Badakhshanīs maintained communications both with members of the Kūch-kūnjid party and with *émigré* Sufīs including Khwājah Ishāq.<sup>75</sup> Unlike the Ḥiṣārīs, meanwhile, the Badakhshanīs had also for some time periodically dispatched military expeditions to weaken the Jānī-Bīkid position south of the Amū Daryā, undertaking campaigns in 1536, 1549 and 1560.<sup>76</sup> Once the Jānī-Bīkid 'Abdallāh b. Iskandar made clear that he, unusually among his Abū'l-Khayrid kinsmen, had both the resources and the inclination to take steps towards punishing such behaviour, the Badakhshanīs and Ḥiṣārīs quickly made common cause: in the *Rawḍat al-riḍwān*, for instance, Badr al-Dīn Kashmīrī reports how the Ḥiṣārī princes offered a sort of early-warning system for their Badakhshani neighbours, undertaking to warn the Badakhshani ruler Sulayman Mīrzā whenever there was a threat of impending Bukharan attack.<sup>77</sup>

The most fateful instance of Ḥiṣārī-Badakhshani cooperation occurred in winter 1572/3. In that year, Hāshim's brother Faqīr Sultan joined the Badakhshani Tīmūrīd prince Sulaymān Mīrzā in dispatching troops to Balkh.<sup>78</sup> On this occasion, the expeditionary force sought not to weaken the locally incumbent Jānī-Bīkid regime but to protect it from attack. By 1572, 'Abdallāh b. Iskandar had expanded the scope of his territorial ambitions, to include not only the holdings of his Suyūnchid and Kūchkūnjid rivals, but also the holdings of his more immediate Jānī-Bīkid kinsmen, among these his first cousin Dīn Muḥammad b. Pīr Muḥammad, the governor of Balkh. Learning of 'Abdallāh's southward ambitions, the rulers of Ḥiṣār and Badakhshan resolved to send a relief force in order to counter his advance.

75 *Ḍiyā al-qulūb*, ff. 46a–48b; for Ishāq's associations with the region see PAPAS, *Soufisme et politique*, p. 86.

76 AKHMEDOV, *Istoriia Balkha*, pp. 81–86; *idem*, "Poslednie Timuridy i bor'ba za Badakhshan," in P. G. BULGAKOV / I. KARIMOV (eds.), *Issledovaniia po istorii, istorii Nauki i kul'tury narodov Srednei Azii* (Tashkent: Fan, 1993), pp. 82–98 [pp. 91–94].

77 Discussion in e.g. M. HAIDAR, *Central Asia in the Sixteenth Century* (Delhi: Manohar, 2002), pp. 223, 249.

78 *Sharaf-nāmah-yi shāhī*, II. 153, ff; *Ḍiyā al-qulūb*, f. 21b; discussion in PAPAS, *Soufisme et politique*, p. 42.



This relief force was not to achieve its intended purpose, however. In the *Ḍiyā al-qulūb*, Mullā Awāz relates that from the outset it was fated to failure. While on the road, we read, Faqīr Sultan had a dream. In this dream, Khwājah Ishāq miraculously appeared to him, and offered a warning: despite Faqīr Sultan's best efforts, the expedition would be unsuccessful, and 'Abdallāh b. Iskandar would succeed in capturing Balkh. Not only this, Ishāq continued: having captured Balkh, 'Abdallāh would proceed then to capture Ḥiṣār. If Faqīr Sultan were wise, therefore, he should abandon the campaign, and flee to safety while still able to do so.<sup>79</sup>

As is predictably the case in hagiographic narrative, Khwājah Ishāq's prophecy proved prescient. The attempted relief of Balkh in 1572/3 turned out to be a disaster. Most immediately, the Ḥiṣāri and Badakhshani expeditionary forces failed, as Ishāq had predicted, to prevent the city from falling to Bukharan troops. By their abortive intervention, the rulers of Ḥiṣār and Badakhshan furthermore succeeded in doing what they would least have wished, namely in immediately focusing 'Abdallāh's attentions on their own respective regimes as targets for elimination.

According to the *Sharaf-nāmah-yi Shāhī*, 'Abdallāh was particularly angry at the behaviour of Faqīr Sultan. He and Faqīr had recently made terms together,<sup>80</sup> we read, and by marching on behalf of Dīn Muḥammad Faqīr rendered himself effectively guilty of treachery. Ḥāfiẓ-i Tānish and other Bukharan authors relate that 'Abdallāh nevertheless offered Faqīr an opportunity to mend his ways, showing him all "princely solicitude" [*ināyat-i pādishāhānah*] and appointing Shāh Muḥammad Mīrzā Manghit to serve as his *aṭālīq*.<sup>81</sup> But Faqīr Sultan's extraordinary "foulness" made him reject 'Abdallāh's authority for good, and instead he returned to Ḥiṣār to foment rebellion.

Our Bukharan sources relate that even after this setback 'Abdallāh remained willing to offer peaceful terms to the Ḥiṣāri regime. He dispatched his envoy Aḥmad Khwājah to Ḥiṣār, to demand of Hāshim Sultan just two conditions, namely that he should levy troops for a Badakhshani campaign against Sulaymān Mīrzā and render up the wretched Faqīr Sultan. Hāshim Sultan's poor character however led him to reject the proffered terms for peace:<sup>82</sup> and 'Abdallāh thus resolved to reduce the city, gathering up a joint contingent of

79 *Ḍiyā al-qulūb*, f. 22a.

80 *Sharaf-nāmah-yi shāhī*, II. 101, 143–144; *Musakhkhīr al-bilād*, p. 276.

81 *Sharaf-nāmah-yi shāhī*, II. 160.

82 *Sharaf-nāmah-yi shāhī*, II. 165–167; *Musakhkhīr al-bilād*, p. 288.

Bukharan and Samarqandi forces and advancing east towards the Ḥiṣār valley. Learning of this development, Hāshim Sultan now made a panicked attempt to sue for terms, belatedly attempting to assure ‘Abdallāh of his absolute loyalty. But Hāshim’s protestations of good faith now counted for little, and some little time later Bukharan forces under the eminent *amīr* Qul Bābā Kūkiltāsh captured the Ḥiṣārī citadel. Together with his brother Abū’l-Qāsim and his cousin Muḥammad Sharīf b. Hastāy, Hāshim Sultan was taken prisoner, and was soon after put to the sword. The mid sixteenth-century Ḥiṣārī regime had come to an end.<sup>83</sup>

## 6. Internal Tensions?

Through their intemperate dealings with ‘Abdallāh b. Iskandar and the Bukharans, Hāshim Sultan and his brother Faqīr hastened the Ḥiṣārī regime’s collapse. It is a moot point, however, whether in other circumstances the regime would have survived much longer after 1573. As the Khwārazmians would find to their cost in the mid 1590s, a policy of non-interference with the Abū’l-Khayrid khanate did little to avert ‘Abdallāh’s rapacious territorial ambitions.<sup>84</sup> It would appear, furthermore, that in the years prior to its collapse the Ḥiṣārī regime was heavily weakened from internal dynastic conflict. The regime fell prey to the same instabilities as, on a somewhat larger scale, did the mid-century Abū’l-Khayrid khanate itself.

As among the Abū’l-Khayrids, so too in sixteenth-century Ḥiṣār did authority devolve gerontocratically to the oldest living descendent of a common eponymous ancestor. Although in the first decade of the sixteenth century Ḥamzah and Maḥdī had shared power, following the re-establishment of Shībānīd authority over Ḥiṣār in ca. 1526 political authority was confined exclusively among Ḥamzah’s own descendents, devolving consecutively to his sons [‘Abd al-] Maṭlab, Burunduq and Tīmūr Sultan. As with the Abū’l-Khayrids also, indi-

83 Sayfī CHALABĪ, *Tārīkh* (ca. 1582), ed. and tr. MATUZ as *L’Ouvrage de Seyfī Çelebi. Historien Ottoman du XVIe Siècle* (Paris: Maisonneuve, 1968), pp. 130 (translation), 202 (text); *Rawḍat al-riḍwān*, ff. 218a–219b; *Sharaf-nāmah-yi shāhī*, II. 169–173; *Musakhkhir al-bilād*, p. 289; AḤMAD b. Shams al-Dīn, *Tārīkh-i miftāḥ al-qulūb* (ca. 1610), MS CHRIST’S CAMBRIDGE Dd.4.6, f. 544b.

84 BURTON, *The Bukharans*, pp. 69–70; A. GÜNDOĞDU, “Hive Hanlığı Tarihi (Yadigar Şiban-ları Devri 1512–1740)” (Ankara University Ph.D. thesis, 1995), pp. 118–119.

vidual members of this ‘Ḥamzahid’ collectivity seem furthermore to have exercised local appanage rule. This is visible, for instance, from material contained in the afore-cited Ottoman intelligence report of ca. 1533. In addition to noting the authority in Ḥiṣār of Burunduq b. Ḥamzah, this report notes that ‘Alī Muḥammad, clearly to be identified a brother of Burunduq,<sup>85</sup> was governor of Qabādiyān, a settlement located some way to the south-southwest.<sup>86</sup> (It is likely that at this time Chāghāniyān was subject to a third Ḥamzahid dynast, though the report’s failure to identify this individual further than ‘Sultan’ makes the point impossible to verify.) Material in the *Mir’āt al-mamālik* suggests that the practice of sub-appanaging Ḥiṣāri territory still continued some twenty years later: Sīdī ‘Alī Ra’īs reports that, at the time of his visit, the region of Dih-i Naw – i.e. Chāghāniyān – was subject to Tīmūr Sultan’s brother ‘Abbās Sultan.<sup>87</sup>

In ca. 1566/7, Hāshim b. Burunduq succeeded his uncle Tīmūr Sultan as formal supreme ruler of Ḥiṣār. The six or seven years of his reign saw the perpetuation of a strongly corporate Ḥiṣāri regime. In the *Sharaf-nāmah-yi shāhī*, Ḥāfiz-i Tānish notes among the *pādishāhs* of Ḥiṣār in the late 1560s such figures as Hāshim, Faqīr, Muẓaffar, Abū’l-Qāsim, Muḥammad Sharīf and Muḥammad Qāsim;<sup>88</sup> in a passage from the *Ẓafar-nāmah-yi Muqīmī* relating to this same period, the poet Muqīmī mentions such figures as Faqīr Sultan, Mahdī Sultan, Abū’l-Qāsim Sultan and Muḥammad Sharīf Sultan,<sup>89</sup> while in the early seventeenth-century *Ḍiyā al-qulūb* Mullā Awāz mentions the likes of Hāshim, Qāsim Sultan, Faqīr Sultan and Shāh Muḥammad Sultan,<sup>90</sup> and in the *Musakhkhir al-bilād* Muḥammad Yār Qatāghān notes Ja‘far Sultan, Muẓaffar Sultan and Abū’l-Qāsim Sultan.<sup>91</sup> Several of these individuals can be clearly identified. Faqīr Sultan and Shāh Muḥammad were brothers of Hāshim b. Burunduq,<sup>92</sup> Mahdi was the son of Nūr Muḥammad b. Burunduq and thus nephew to Hāshim, Faqīr and Shāh Muḥammad,<sup>93</sup> and Muḥammad Sharīf was the son of Hastāy b. Ḥamzah, and thus first cousin to Mahdi and second cousin once removed to Hāshim

85 *Sharaf-nāmah-yi shāhī*, I. 76.

86 BACQUÉ-GRAMMONT, “Une liste ottomane de princes et d’apanages Abu’l-Khayrides,” pp. 430–431.

87 *Mir’āt al-mamālik*, p. 129.

88 *Sharaf-nāmah-yi shāhī*, II. 37, pp. 218–222.

89 MUQĪMĪ, *Ẓafar-nāmah-yi Muqīmī* (ca. 1595), MS IVANRUZ 3901, f. 19b.

90 *Ḍiyā al-qulūb*, f. 15a.

91 *Musakhkhir al-bilād*, pp. 219, 260.

92 *Sharaf-nāmah-yi shāhī*, I. 76, *Iskandar-nāmah* f. 115b, *Ughūz-nāmah*, f. 66a.

93 *Ughūz-nāmah*, f. 66a.

and his brothers.<sup>94</sup> The fact that Muḥammad Sharīf comprised part of the ruling collective indicates that descent from Ḥamzah, rather than from one of his sons such as Burunduq, remained a sufficient condition for membership of the ruling collective until the last days of the mid sixteenth-century Ḥiṣārī regime. From the 1550s onwards, however, the proliferation of competing ‘Ḥamzahid’ stakeholders evidently began to cause political difficulties.

One source in which we get a picture of these difficulties is a mid sixteenth-century hagiography devoted to the life of Luṭfullāh Chustī. In the *Sirāj al-Sālikīn*, the author Muḥammad Rahīm tells how, on first arriving in Ḥiṣār, Luṭfullāh Chustī found himself confronted by a number of mutually ill-disposed Ḥiṣārī princes, all of whom had hitherto been contending for power among themselves: that Luṭfullāh Chustī was able to reconcile such figures as Abū’l-Muẓaffar, Waqqās and ‘Abbās Sultan, we read, was itself a reflection of his transcendent spiritual authority.<sup>95</sup> But if Luṭfullāh was thus able to preserve the peace it seems only to have been as a temporary measure. In the *Sharaf-Nāmah-i Shāhī*, Ḥāfiẓ-i Tānīsh gives a strong indication of ongoing intra-dynastic tensions. Relating events in the wake of the Bukharan conquest of Ḥiṣār, he relates that Hāshim Sultan was put to death at the hands of a certain Ḥājī Muḥammad. Ḥājī Muḥammad, we read, was the son of the late Tīmūr Sultan: and he volunteered to execute Hāshim Sultan by way of revenge. He wanted revenge because Hāshim had murdered his father.<sup>96</sup>

The claim that Hāshim Sultan acceded to power having murdered his predecessor finds little support elsewhere outside the Bukharan narrative tradition. The more Samarqand-centric *Ḍiyyā al-Qulūb*, for instance, reports nothing untoward in the circumstances of Tīmūr’s passing away and Hāshim’s accession to authority.<sup>97</sup> But Ḥāfiẓ-i Tānīsh’s account seems entirely plausible, particularly when one considers what scope for contestation there must have been among the numerous named members of the Ḥamzahid collective. These numerous stakeholders would have placed heavy demands on Ḥiṣār’s confined resource base, with a growing number of ruling dynasts resulting in a correspondingly inflated number of constituencies of political support, each demanding redistributive access to a dwindling pool of wealth. With a little poetic licence, one might describe Ḥiṣār as a pond, and these dynasts and their political constituencies as

94 *Ibid.*

95 *Sirāj al-sālikīn*, f. 110a.

96 *Sharaf-nāmah-yi shāhī*, II. 173.

97 *Ḍiyyā al-qulūb*, f. 15a.

that pond's ballooning biomass; to extend the metaphor, both the *Sirāj al-Sālikīn* and the *Sharaf-Nāmah-i Shāhī* give the acute impression that in the years before its downfall the Ḥiṣārī regime was finding itself under intense ecological pressure.

## 7. A Ḥamzahid Afterlife?

There is perhaps one further piece of evidence suggesting that internal tensions hastened the fall of Ḥiṣār to Bukharan attack. This is the fact that, when Qul Bābā Kūkiltāsh stormed the city in 1573, among the members of the ruling collective only Hāshim, Abū'l-Qāsim and Muḥammad Sharīf are related as having been inside the citadel.<sup>98</sup> The majority of Ḥamzahid dynasts appear to have been elsewhere at the time, and thus presumably failed to commit resources towards the defence of the city. If the failure to present a common Ḥamzahid front precipitated the fall of Ḥiṣār, however, it also enabled numerous dynasts on that occasion to evade capture. Indeed, several Ḥamzahid dynasts are attested to have remained active in the eastern territories of the khanate for several years after 1573. Hāfiz-i Tānish notes, for instance, that in 1578 the Ḥamzahids Faqīr Sultan, Muḥammad Sharīf Sultan, Muḥammad Qāsim Sultan and Mahdī Sultan aligned themselves with the Suyūnchid forces of Bābā Sultan b. Nawrūz Aḥmad in battle against the Jānī-Bīkids at Zamīn, near Samarqand. The Zamīn battle resulted in a heavy victory for 'Abdallāh b. Iskandar, and most members of the former Ḥiṣārī party were captured and put to death.<sup>99</sup> Only two Ḥamzahids appear to have survived thereafter. One of these was Muḥammad Qāsim Sultan, who in 1579/80 allied with the Badakhshani Tīmūrid Shāhrukh Mīrẓā b. Mīrẓā Ibrāhim b. Shāh Sulaymān and the fugitive Kūchkhūnjid Muẓaffar Sultan b. Jawānmard 'Alī to make an unsuccessful attempt on Jānī-Bīkid-held Balkh;<sup>100</sup> the circumstances of his fate are uncertain. The second was Mahdī Sultan who, according to a late sixteenth-century Bukharo-centric verse chronicle, in 1584 warned the Badakhshani ruler Sulaymān Mīrẓā of impending attack from 'Ab-

98 *Sharaf-nāmah-yi shāhī*, II. 173, *Musakkhkhir al-bilād*, p. 289 (Hāshim and Muḥammad Sharīf); *Rawḍat al-riḍwān*, f. 219b (Hāshim and Abū'l-Qāsim).

99 *Sharaf-nāmah-yi shāhī*, II. 218–222.

100 *Musakkhkhir al-bilād*, p. 219.

dallāh's Bukharan forces.<sup>101</sup> Again, we hear nothing more about Mahdī Sultan, and the Ḥamzahid family hereafter disappears from the historical record.

Even around the time of its final extirpation, the Ḥamzahid family evidently remained popular among the local Ḥiṣārī population. This emerges from a passing comment in the *Sharaf-nāmah-yi shāhī* which has hitherto been denied the attention that it deserves. After the Zamīn battle, we read, 'Abdallāh b. Iskandar bound several of his Ḥamzahid captives over to Ūzbik Sultan, his cousin and Ḥiṣārī gubernatorial appointee, for execution back in Ḥiṣār.<sup>102</sup> 'Abdallāh's concern to accord the Ḥamzahids a highly visible death in Ḥiṣār is telling. It implies that 'Abdallāh was keen to impress upon the Ḥiṣārī population the fact that the former ruling regime had indeed come to an end, thus presumably to minimise scope for subsequent pretenders to claim Ḥamzahid identity in their own bids for power. Closely paralleling later moves to terminate ongoing attachments towards the defeated Suyūnchid party in Tashkent,<sup>103</sup> such behaviour suggests that 'Abdallāh was aware of a local sense of sympathy towards the Ḥamzahid family which neither Ḥāfiẓ-i Tānīsh nor any other Bukharan chronicler can bring himself directly to acknowledge.<sup>104</sup> After carefully having presented the Ḥamzahids' behaviour towards 'Abdallāh b. Iskandar as an affront to conventionally acceptable behaviour, Ḥāfiẓ-i Tānīsh here betrays the fact that in the late 1570s there existed a constituency of Ḥiṣāris for whom the termination of the Ḥamzahid regime had itself constituted an affront to locally accepted norms.

## 8. Rethinking the Ḥamzahids of Ḥiṣār

The history of sixteenth-century Central Asia is the history of 'Abdallāh b. Iskandar, and of his reformulation of political authority from perquisite of the ruling collective to monopoly of the sovereign monarch. But it is the history also of those regimes which resisted 'Abdallāh's reformulation of authority. These were regimes which, in the wake of their defeat, we tend to conceptualise in the light of their treatment by an unsympathetic late sixteenth-century narrative

101 Badr al-Dīn KASHMĪRĪ, *Rawḍat al-salāṭīn* (ca. 1593) MS BL Or. 14244, f. 434a.

102 *Sharaf-nāmah-yi shāhī*, II, 222.

103 *Musakhkhir al-bilād*, p. 168.

104 For the phenomenon of "local loyalty" in early-modern Central Asia, see WELSFORD, "Loyalty, Welfare and Selfhood," pp. 213–291.

tradition which was beholden to ‘Abdallāh’s revised disposition of power: and among them were the Ҳамzahids of ҲишЌр. By diversifying our perspectives upon this long-neglected regime, we derive a salutary impression of how the late sixteenth-century narrative tradition all too often distorts our readings of early modern Central Asia’s political ecology. As recollected from *fin de siècle* Bukhara, the Ҳамzahids of ҲишЌр had a status very different from that accorded them in earlier sources: and in the wake of its incremental late sixteenth-century demise, the ‘Abū’l-Khayrid khanate was remembered as something rather different from that larger, looser collective which earlier contemporaries apparently would have understood. In the story of sixteenth-century ҲишЌр, we begin to see how authority in sixteenth-century Central Asia was repeatedly conceived and re-conceived according to circumstance.

Overlooked by historians though it has all too often been, the story of the Ҳамzahids usefully illustrates for us, first in the circumstances of their rule and secondly in the narrative treatment posthumously accorded them, some of the obscurer political dynamics in early-modern Central Asia. Like Lévi-Strauss’s animals, the Ҳамzahids of sixteenth-century ҲишЌр are good for thinking with.